

JS-6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES BRADLEY JR., et al.,) Case No. CV 22-5623 FMO (JPRx)
Plaintiffs,)
v.) **ORDER RE: DISMISSAL WITHOUT
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, et al.,) PREJUDICE**
Defendants.)

)

The court is in receipt of the parties' Joint Statement Re: Status of Settlement (Dkt. 75, "Statement"), seeking a stay of all proceedings pending approval of the settlement by Los Angeles County officials. (See id.).

In the court's experience with similar requests based on conditional settlements requiring county board or city council approval, staying such cases requires the continued commitment of judicial resources to monitoring the cases and ensuring compliance with requirements to file status reports. It also increases the burden on the parties to have their counsel attend status conferences, file status reports, or seek dismissal of the stayed case upon resolution of the matter.

It appears that the more efficient approach is to dismiss this action without prejudice to either party moving to reopen nunc pro tunc in the event that further court intervention becomes necessary. The court perceives no practical difference between this approach and the relief

1 requested by the parties, apart from eliminating the need for future monitoring or action if the
2 parties honor their agreement, as the court expects them to.

3 Based on the foregoing, IT IS ORDERED THAT this action is **dismissed without**
4 **prejudice** to any party seeking to vacate this Order and reopen the action nunc pro tunc in the
5 event that the settlement does not receive approval by the relevant governmental authorities.

6 Dated this 30th day of January, 2024.

7
8 _____ /s/
9 Fernando M. Olguin
United States District Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28